

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims set forth in the Official Action of November 3, 2005, are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-22 are currently pending.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 5-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US2003/0126068 A1 to Hauk et al. (“Hauk”). Applicants respectfully submit that “Hauk” is not prior art to the instant invention.

The earliest possible priority date of Hauk is November 18, 1999. In the first Official Action of case (mailed October 10, 2004), the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled “Virtual Reality Trading Floor Adds New Dimension,” in Computerworld, Vol. 33, Issue 13, p. 67, Framingham and dated March 29, 1999 (hereinafter “Computerworld Article”). In response, Applicants submitted a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 dated December 9, 2004 by inventor Dror Segal which explained that the Computerworld Article was a description of the inventors’ own invention. In an Official Action dated March 31, 2005, the Examiner stated that “[t]he Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 12/20/04 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-20 based upon 102(a)

rejection ‘Virtual reality trading floor adds new dimension’, Computerworld. Framingham: March 29, 1999.Vol.33, Iss 13, pg 67.” Thus, the Examiner has already been satisfied that the subject matter of Claims 1-20 were invented by Applicants prior to November 18, 1999, the earliest priority date of Hauk. For further support, Applicants submit herewith a Declaration under CFR § 1.131 by inventor Dror Segal providing the information submitted under the previous Declaration under CFR § 1.132.

Because all claim rejections depend on Hauk being prior art to the instant application -- which it is not, in view of the above, Applicants believe that all rejections have been overcome and Claims 1-22 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 2, 2006



---

Gary M. Butter  
Patent Office Reg. No. 33,841

30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10012-4498

*Attorneys for Applicants*  
(212) 408-2500